USAID/Ethiopia Results Management Workshop

December 26, 1996

Submitted to:

Marge Bonner
Mission Director
USAID/Ethiopia

USAID/Ethiopia Results Management Workshop

Summary

The reengineering effort that was initiated more than two years ago in USAID is now taking a more substantial operational hold on most USAID missions. USAID/Ethiopia is no exception, but does find itself in a rather unique position in that the mission in Addis Ababa has only had an in-country existence dating back approximately three years. For this reason, perhaps, the difficulties that reengineering has prompted in many USAID missions, in terms of convincing staff of the intrinsic values of the reengineering approach, has not been a major challenge to the Addis Mission. Likewise, outright resistance to reengineering seems to be largely absent in USAID/Ethiopia. This good news aside, there is a considerable amount of reengineering-oriented preparatory work which must be completed before USAID/Ethiopia can confidently proceed with its development activities. Consequently, a training workshop, conducted by Management Systems International, was held in Addis Ababa 9-20 December 1996. Selected staff from the Addis Mission, along with four members of the mission in Eritrea, were invited to participate. The 24-member participant group was, for selected sessions, supplemented by other Mission personnel as detailed below.

I. Venue/Logistics

The workshop was held at the Red Cross Training Centre approximately 30 minutes from the USAID mission. Each of the ten training days was divided into four sessions - two in the a.m. and two in the p.m. of approximately 90 minutes duration each. While the majority of sessions were held in one training room, a separate break-out room was available to the participants as were several outdoor areas. Participants met at the Mission each morning for group transport and were brought back to the mission shortly before the end of the Mission=s working day thus affording the participants daily opportunities to pick up mail, respond to emails, etc.. The Centre proved to be an excellent training venue. It is highly recommended that this site be considered for any subsequent trainings in the future.

II. Approach

It was made clear to Mission staff prior to contract signing that MSI did not, in fact, have a one-size-fits-all type of reengineering course, but that we could draw upon our ample experience over the past two years and develop a course to meet the Mission=s needs. We also made it clear to the training participants that the workshop trainers were not going to conduct a **A**course**@** as such. Rather, the MSI team would present information on specific reengineering concepts followed by Strategic Objective Team activities in order to **A**operationalize**@** these concepts. In addition to reengineering-specific topics, a series of team-building exercises were also conducted. The team building exercises helped to support the core value of team work that is essential to the reengineered USAID.

The workshop agenda (see Annex 1), therefore, included an on-going reengineering stream of (**A** RM**@**) activities as well as team-building (**A**TB**@**) activities. While the Mission would have preferred to send all Mission employees to the 10-day workshop, work demands precluded this as a realistic option. Critical sessions were therefore identified on the agenda so that other SO Team members could participate as their respective schedules allowed.

By immediately following most reengineering presentations with SO Team-specific activities, the Mission=s SO Teams were able to apply the concepts in a manner most compatible with their level of development. While not all participants were members of SOTs, for the workshop each person worked with a specific team. For some of the activities, the four members from Eritrea found it more advantageous to attach themselves to established Addis SO teams - learning from their discussions/activities - while in other activities, they met as a group themselves looking at Eritrean-specific concerns. During the SO Team activities, each of the two trainers provided one-on-one assistance to each group.

Some content areas of the workshop agenda were so Mission-specific in terms of operational procedures and/or approach that Mission staff were recruited to provide direct assistance during the workshop (as anticipated prior to the workshop). Stand-alone sessions were provided in the following areas:

- C   Acquisitions and Assistance,
- C   Overview of the New Management Systems program - its purpose and current status of development and utilization,
- C   Training (concerns regarding both participant training as well as in-house staff training), and
- C   Input from the Controller=s Office

III. Findings/Observations

An end-of-course evaluation was completed by most participants. The following findings/observations are obviously not based on in-depth assessments of each respective team=s current strengths/weaknesses, but rather our perceptions based on each team=s performance during the workshop. The fact that the entire teams were <u>not</u> present during the workshop compromises our ability to more accurately assess their current status.)

SO1 (Agriculture): The Ag team seems to be working under a particularly difficult situation. Not only are there staffing numbers down, but the GOE is simply not demonstrating the level of support necessary for this SOT to fully proceed as they would prefer. Their knowledge of reengineering concepts appears sound. Their ability to identify appropriate indicators and data collection techniques appears sound, but, under the circumstances, largely untested. If and when this team is able to work more fully with the GOE, they will want to re-define their Results Framework - to do so now would be premature and may not be very productive.

SO2 (Health): This team seems to have gained the most from the workshop. While they appeared to be relatively further along than SOTs 1, 4, and 5, there really wasn=t a very strong operational basis upon which to proceed. The SO2 team took advantage of the opportunity afforded by the workshop and was able to not only begin speaking the same language (from shared understandings of basic reengineering terminology/concepts), but also to begin developing a pragmatic approach to dealing with their on-line activities in a more reengineered way with an eye towards the approaches they may take in the future in creating new results packages.

SO3 (Education): As odd as it might sound, this seemingly well-established SOT may, in fact, pose some significant difficulties for the Mission in the future. The current BESO project so dominates this team=s activities that scant little attention seems to have been placed by the team on the approaches necessary to create new results packages in the future when BESO closes out or is continued in a different form. In our opinion, the SO3 team focused too much attention on force fitting BESO into an RF and too little attention on future growth opportunities (i.e. innovative ideas underlying new Results Packages which may prove their value in helping to achieve specified IRs and the overall SO itself).

SO4 (D&G): This SOT is virtually starting from a blank slate. The Results Framework itself needs serious attention. While the team has had detailed discussions regarding many aspects of this ill-defined, generically-difficult sector, there appears to be very little, too little, with which the team can pragmatically proceed. The very process of developing sound Intermediate Results and their associated indicators and PMPs will help drive the team towards developing approaches which are programmatically sound while being Ado-able@.

SpO1 (Food Security): As with the SO1 team, a greater level of collaborative planning and program execution with the GOE would seem to benefit this team=s efforts. The teams= knowledge of reengineering concepts and terminology appears sound and they should have no significant difficulty in pushing for a more reengineered approach to their work should they be afforded the opportunity to do so.

Eritrea (both SO2 and SO3): As expressed by the four participants from USAID/Eritrea themselves and observed by the workshop trainers, the Asmara group has had very little exposure to reengineering principles and terminology. The workshop appeared to be very worthwhile for them in providing many of the basics they need in order to more fully operationalize their development efforts within the new reengineering environment. The tasks before them may appear to be overly daunting, however, as development of virtually every area needs to be pursued (revision of their RF, identification of SO Core and Expanded teams, development of team norms, development of RPs, PMPs and CSPs, etc.).

Other Findings/Observations (in no particularly order of priority):

1) While it would be ideal to have a resident M&E advisor sitting on each of the established SO Teams, staffing levels clearly will not allow for same.

2) The participants from Contracts and the Controller=s Office appeared to be somewhat disappointed that specifics regarding NMS were not as plentiful as hoped for.

3) The issue of exactly how the various SO teams will interact with each other, formally, as well as with the front office remains unclear. Various models enacted by other missions were presented to the group but time did not allow for the identification, by the group as a whole, of any definitive approach. Most SO teams expressed continued interest in the already-established practice of holding bi-weekly meetings with the front office, but considerable interest also appeared for a more formal mechanism to oversee communications and joint-planning activities.

4) The issue of delegations of authority was brought up several times during the workshop. It is clearly on everyone=s mind but remains a source of confusion.

IV. Recommendations

SO 1 (Agriculture):

C   The team may want to explore the possibility of developing new Results Packages with the direct involvement of MOA officials - RPs which are modest in design and require a relatively small resource base to accomplish. Such RPs, while genuinely contributing to the achievement of specific IRs, would have the dual purpose of building levels of trust and confidence with MOA officials serving as a platform for broader and more ambitious RPs in the future.

C   While SOT 1 did review other Customer Service Plans during the workshop, a formal effort should be initiated to codify an SOT 1-specific CSP (to include internal CSP considerations - i.e. the services exchanged between SOT 1 and Mission support services (admin/Controller=s Office/Contracts).

C   Discussions regarding a formal charter or pact with the front office should be continued and finalized into a working document.

C   The Results Review portion of the Mission=s R4 submission needs to be drafted (emphasis during the workshop focused on Title III only).

C   While performance collection methods were discussed during the workshop, SOT 1 needs to formalize their approach and identify appropriate collection methods.

C   NMS roles need to be assigned.

C   Leadership roles within SOT 1 were discussed at the workshop, but need to be finalized.

SO 2 (Health):

C   The Health RF should be distributed to the expanded SO team for feedback and any revisions finalized at 13 January expanded SOT meeting.

C   During the workshop, SOT 2 was able to roughly define a Results Package, but more discussions need to take place in order to clearly define RPT member composition and their individual and collective responsibilities in helping to achieve cited IRs. (Suggested that such discussions take place at the 13 January expanded SO meeting.)

C   Recommended that SOT 2 go ahead and utilize their SOT charter with the front office with signatures of new team members.

C   PMP needs to be developed and finalized with particular emphasis on methods to be used for data collection.

C   Results Review portion of the Mission=s R4 submission needs to be drafted by end of January.

C   NMS roles need to be identified.

SO3 (Education):

C   New and innovative Results Package development should be encouraged and actively explored by SOT 3. The idea of constituting new RPTs to specifically oversee specified activities in support of an established SO 3 IR should be explored. This should help support attainment of BESO objectives while setting the stage for future new RP development in support of any newly-established or revised IRs.

C   Recommended that SOT 3 not wait to be notified of NMS roles within their SOT, but, rather, to create them themselves with active participation of Controller=s/Contracts offices when considering ADS-mandated or specified roles.

SO4 (D&G):

C   More than any other SOT, this team will need some assistance in developing a sound RF for which specific Results Packages can be developed. A new RF, if even only in final draft form, should be completed before February submission of the R4.

C   While some promising efforts were initiated during the workshop in regards to identifying both Core and Expanded SO teams, SOT 4 will need to make this a high priority over the

coming weeks - not only in identifying members and roles, but also in more clearly delineating specific responsibilities and team norms.

C   Once the above steps are firmly in place, discussions will need to take place and a specific follow-on action agenda developed for the following areas:
>-identification of activities/other elements making up Results Packages
>-development of a PMP
>-development of a Customer Service Plan

C   The approach taken during the workshop whereby each member of SOT 4 is to oversee a specific IR stream is encouraging and should be reinforced by the front office. When SOT 4 meets to codify team norms, particular attention should be paid to reengineering=s empowerment core value. Designated RPT leaders need to take full managerial control of their respective areas - taking the lead in designing RPs which best lend themselves towards achieving specified IRs.

C   Results Review portion of the Mission=s R4 submission needs to be drafted by end of January.

C   USAID/Ethiopia may want to consider contracting out (ex-USA or via a local consultant if one can be identified) to work further with this SO team in refining their RF, identifying possible RPs, developing a PMP, etc..

SpO1 (Food Security):

C   Discussions during the workshop in regards to identifying Core and Expanded SO team members needs to be continued and membership finalized. Member roles and responsibilities need to be more clearly defined and overall team norms codified.

C   While the SpO1 team may feel no need to identify an RPT as such, specific RPs should still be developed in order to more accurately ascertain results achieved against more discrete sets of activities making up the overall SO.

C   Results Review portion of the Mission=s R4 submission needs to be drafted by end of January.

C   As with the SO 3 Education team, new and innovative Results Package development should be encouraged and actively explored.

C   An SpO1 - front office draft and PMP draft were both initiated during the workshop - both of these documents should be finalized before the R4 submission.

Eritrea (Rural Enterprise Investment Program, SO 2):

C   Some ideas were initiated during the workshop in regards to establishing a Core and Expanded SO, but discussions need to be continued and a plan finalized.

C   Likewise, some ideas were initiated during the workshop in regards to establishing Results Packages in support of the SO, but discussions need to be continued with appropriate personnel in Asmara.

C   Work on an SOT - front office charter or pact should be initiated in Asmara.

C   NMS roles need to be assigned and, due to the nature of Asmara=s special relationship with both Addis and Nairobi, clear lines of authority and operational responsibility need to be codified.

Eritrea (Democracy ad Governance, SO 3):

C   A draft was developed during the workshop in regards to establishing a definitive Core and Expanded SO which will need to be finalized in Asmara.

C   Roles within SOT 3 were more clearly defined during the workshop, but specific responsibilities need to be delineated.

C   Likewise, norms for SOT 3 were drafted during the workshop, but more discussion needs to take place - especially in regards to decision-making/conflict resolution.

C   Once the SO 3 RF is revised, efforts must begin in terms of developing specific Results Packages in support of the respective IRs.

C   Work on an SOT - front office charter or pact should be initiated in Asmara.

C   As with Eritrea=s SO2, NMS roles need to be assigned with special consideration given to the Addis/Nairobi data input/reporting relationship.

C   As with USAID/Ethiopia=s D&G-oriented SO4 team, Asmara=s SO 3 team will need some assistance in developing a sound RF for which specific Results Packages can be developed. USAID/Eritrea may want to consider contracting out for further TA to this group.

Other Recommendations (in no particularly order of priority):

1) A specific structure/mechanism should be considered by the USAID/Ethiopia Mission to enhance SOT-SOT and SOT-front office communications and joint-planning activities. Based on informal conversations with various SO team members during the workshop, it appears the

USAID/South Africa practice of utilizing an overarching SO team composed of two reps from each of the SOTs (one of whom is an FSN) should be looked at in more detail. The idea of having a rotating chairmanship of such a grouping seemed to appeal to many workshop participants.

2) Regarding delegations of authority: Both the Controller=s Office and Contracts seem to have some definite guidance they are able to give on the subject as it relates to their respective areas. Such guidance does not appear to have been clearly communicated to the SO teams. Programmatic delegations of authority are stated in the ADS, but, again, have not been clearly communicated to SO teams. Except for clearly-delineated fiduciary responsibilities or those clearly mandated by ADS provisions, it is recommended that the SO teams collectively define their own delegations of authority and that their recommendation(s) be considered by the Mission for issuance under Mission Order.

3) It is strongly recommended that small groups of workshop participants, especially those from the controller=s office and from Contracts, be provided the opportunity to go through the NMS training (which, to a large degree, can be done on site).

4) Continue support of Toastmasters! Many participants mentioned how highly they thought of this Aextra-curricular@ activity. The fact that Toastmaster activities seem to reinforce the efforts towards empowerment necessary for reengineering to work as expected would be reason enough to recommend continued support.

V. Conclusion

It appears very clear that the 24 participants (and additional Mission staff who participated at various times), benefitted from this workshop. For those with little or no exposure to reengineering, the workshop provided the basic terminology and underlying concepts which must be understood by all Mission personnel in order to achieve the level of AResults Management@ envisioned under USAID reengineering. For those more seasoned in reengineering, the workshop afforded the opportunity to focus on operationalizing basic concepts to best meet USAID/Ethiopia=s overall development objectives. In addition to the reengineering-specific elements presented, the number of team-building exercises conducted during the workshop will help foster a working environment within the Mission in which team-oriented reengineering efforts can be more fully realized.

Due to time limitations and the fact that not all SO team members participated in the workshop, the list of definitively completed actions is small. There were, however, a large number of very real accomplishments in terms of each SO team (including the Eritrean participants) more clearly defining those specific elements of reengineering requiring follow-up action and the initiation of specific approaches to be taken when finalizing those actions.

The workshop trainers wish to thank the USAID/Ethiopia Mission for their unqualified support in preparation for, and conduct of, this workshop. A special thanks goes out to Mission Director Marge Bonner, Bill Douglass, Ron Bonner, Carolyn Eldridge, Mario Rocha, Doug Arbuckle, and the many support staff who assisted in making this workshop a worthwhile experience for all involved.

ANNEX 1

Workshop Agenda

Workshop Agenda
Results Management Workshop
USAID/Ethiopia

Monday, 09 December

9:00   Welcome and introductions
            Exercise: Interview someone you don≠t know: name, position, expectations, one
            thing that you would like to come away from this workshop knowing how to do.
            -Expectations and objectives
            -Norms, schedule and notebook

10:30   *Exercise*: Thinking Out of the Boxes

11:00   **RM1: Overview of USAID Results Management System**
                 The Core Values - lecturette
            Exercise: Discussion of the core values as they are applied to our jobs. In small
            groups discuss what is new and what are current best practices. How do the core
            values affect their job and what are some new things that haven≠t been done before.
            Review in plenary.

1:00   **RM2: Setting the Stage: The Strategic Plan** lecturette (overheads)

1:30   **RM3: Results Frameworks**: lecturette (overheads)
                 Definitions: RF, SO, IRs Indicators

2:00   *Exercise*: In SO Teams, review of existing RFs with an eye to results management:
            are results clear and understandable; is anything missing (verification of the development
            hypothesis; measurement problems?; are there assumptions that should be IRs.

4:00   **TB1: MBTI Assessment**

Tuesday, 10 December

9:00   **RM4: Strategic Objective Teams** lecturette (overheads)
                 Roles and Responsibilities

Membership: USAID, Partners, Virtual, Customers

Exercise: In existing SOTs, discuss the following: Do current teams need to be expanded with the addition of partners, customers or virtual members? What will be their roles? What issues are raised in their participation?

10:00   **RM5: Results Packages and RP Teams**
         Definitions
         What does a RPTeam do?
         Roles and Responsibilities
         Activities for Achieving

Exercise: What are the different roles and responsibilities of SOTs and RPTs? In plenary discussion. Are there things that are done that don=t fit in these categories?

11:30   **TB2: Why Teams: Characteristics of High Performing Teams** lecturette with discussion of how teams are different than offices.

1:00   *Exercise:* Synergy - Desert Survival

3:00   **TB3: Problem Solving** lecturette on steps in problem solving

3:30   **TB4: Planning and Decision making Techniques**:
     Exercise: Brainstorming on some relevant problem
     Exercise: SWOT on some relevant question (maybe in SOTs)

Wednesday, 11 December

9:00   **RM6: Country Strategic Plan, Concept Paper** lecturette
         Mission=s Contract for Results
         R4 Process and Budgeting

10:00   **RM7: Customer Service Planning** lecturette
         Roles of customers
         Participatory Data Gathering Techniques: lecturette

Exercise: Discussion of customer participation in activities; use of data gathering techniques.

1:00   **TB5: Team Effectiveness Critique**
     Exercise: Use the Alexander Team Effectiveness Critique in SOTs

2:30   **RM8: Results Packages: Existing Activities** lecturette

Incorporating existing activities and projects
Changes that should be made to focus on results
Deob/Reob Process

3:45   *Exercise*: In SOTs, look at existing activities to determine if any changes should be made to focus on results.

Thursday, 12 December

9:00   **TB6: MBTI** lecturette with discussion and experience
            Exercise: Experience different types; verify assessment results

1:00   **RM9: Results Packages: New Activities** lecturette
            Exercise: Use of Stakeholders Analysis

Friday, 13 December

9:00   **RM9: Results Packages: New Activities continued**
            Exercise: Use of Force Field Analysis

10:00   Participatory planning

11:00   *Exercise:* Participatory design techniques

1:00   **TB7: Decision making in Groups** lecturette
            Exercise: Use of the VROOM Model, small group cases

Monday, 16 December

09:00   **RM10: Acquisitions and Assistance** - lecturette (Carolyn Eldridge) - Deciding
            on which vehicle to use- RFPs and RFAs; Planning, timeline, who to get
involved; role of SOT and RPT (esp partners), etc.

12:00 Lunch

1:00   **RM10: Acquisitions and Assistance** (cont.)
            RM11: Scopes of Work/Budgeting for Activities - lecturette (Carolyn Eldridge)

Tuesday, 17 December

9:00   **RM12: Monitoring for Results** - lecturette; PMP
            Exercise: Monitoring at SO and RP levels In SOTs; groups re-examine their
indicators for appropriateness and begin revisions as necessary.

12:00   Lunch

*1:00 **RM13: SOTs**
           Exercise: Group develop schematics of their respective SOTs and expanded SOTs

*2:30   **TB9: Characteristics of Team Development/Leadership** - lecturette
           Exercise: Practice in groups on observing roles in group setting

Wednesday, 18 December

 9:00   **RM14: Financial Management Concerns**- lecturette

10:30   **RM15: NMS** - lecturette (Bill Douglass)

12:00   Lunch

 1:00   **TB10: Conflict Management** - lecturette
           Exercise: Thomas Kilman conflict management techniques

*2:30   **TB11: Decision Making/Team Norms** - lecturette

Thursday, 19 December

 9:00   **RM16: Participant Training** - lecturette (Ron Bonner)

10:00   **TB12: Staff Training** - lecturette (Doug Arbuckle)

10:45   **RM17: Stakeholders Analysis** - lecturette
           Exercise: SOT Stakeholder Analysis

12:00   Lunch

 1:00   **RM18: Evaluation/Participatory Planning** - lecturette. When and Why; Types
           of Evaluations
           Exercise: Discussion in SOTs

 2:30   **RM19: Customer Service Plans** - lecturette. Basic elements; internal Aplans@ vs
           external formal documents
           Exercise: SOTs begin revising their respective CSPs.

Friday, 20 December

9:00   **RM20: Delegations of Authority to SOTs and RPTs** - lecturette
            Exercise: Plenary group discussion on roles of staff; offices vis-a-vis SOTs and
        RPTs - SOTs revisit/develop agreements w/front office & each other.

11:00   **RM21: Review of Results Management Process** - review of the steps
            involved in RM (Country Strategic Plan, Mgmnt Contract, RF dev., SOAG,
        SOT/RPT, etc.)
            Exercise: SOTs draw from the review list and identify specific areas for follow-up
        as well as any specific recommendations regarding those specific areas they will
        take back to their Mission for consideration/ resolution/finalization.

            -Workshop Evaluation

12:00   Lunch

4:00   Certificates/Closing Remarks - Marge Bonner

ANNEX 2

List of Participants

[List of participants here]

[List of Participants by SO group here]

ANNEX 3

Scope of Work

[Insert SOW here]